

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/915,743	07/26/2001	Gary S. Huff	BP 1518	7879
7	7590 05/20/2003			٠
Bruce E. Garlick			EXAMINER	
P. O. Box 160° Austin, TX 78			RYMAN, DANIEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2665	12
			DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003	19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	v				
Advisory Action	09/915,743	HUFF, GARY S.					
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit					
<b>\</b>	Daniel J. Ryman	2665					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 02 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment				
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· <i>, ,</i> —		and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

10. Other: \_\_\_\_





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues on page 38 of the response that establishing a link and later dropping the link is not the same thing as never establishing a link. Examiner agrees. Examiner's position is that a link which becomes corrupted due to errors can be viewed as a failed link. In Feuerstraeter, a connection can become corrupted due to errors imposed by the cable. Since the cable is present from the start of the attempted communication, it is clear that the corruption due to the cable will also be present from the start of the attempted communication. Due to the cable corruptions, viable communication is never present upon the attempted link and therefore the link is never established. By extention, due to the cable corruptions, the first network device fails to establish a link that can support data communications at the first link speed. In view of this interpretation, Examiner maintains that the amended claims have not overcome Feuerstraeter in view of Cochennec and therefore the amendments do not place the claims in condition for allowance. In addition, the arguments do not place the application in better form for appeal since the Applicant argues similar points already put forth in previous responses and in the interview.